

ON THE COMPLEMENTARITY PRINCIPLE

E. S. Guerra

Departamento de Física

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro

Cx. Postal 23851, 23890-000 Seropédica, RJ, Brazil

email: emerson@ufrj.br

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We present a scheme in which we investigate the two-slit experiment and the the principle of complementarity.

PACS: 03.65.Ud; 03.67.Mn; 32.80.-t; 42.50.-p

Keywords: principle of complementarity, cavity QED.

The investigation of the double slit experiment in which we have two micromaser cavities, each one associated with one of the slits, was proposed before by Scully and Walther in a series of very interesting articles where they investigate the principle of complementarity and the uncertainty principle [1, 2, 3] and they conclude that the principle of complementarity is more fundamental than the uncertainty principle. Recently we have published an article [4] where we have got the same conclusion. In this article we proceed with a further investigation of the subject studied in [4].

As in [4] first we are going to consider a screen with two slits SL_1 (at ζ_1) and SL_2 (at ζ_2) with two cavities C_1 and C_2 behind respectively each slit, through which fly Rydberg atoms of relatively long radiative lifetimes [5], and first prepared in coherent state $|\alpha\rangle_1$ and $|\alpha\rangle_2$ [3, 6] respectively and later we consider the cavities prepared in an even coherent state $|+\rangle_1$ and an odd coherent state $|-\rangle_2$ respectively, where

$$|\pm\rangle_k = |\alpha\rangle_k \pm |-\alpha\rangle_k \quad (1)$$

[7]. We also assume perfect microwave cavities, that is, we neglect effects due to decoherence.

Let us consider a three-level lambda atom interacting with the electromagnetic field inside a cavity where the upper and the two degenerated lower states are $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$ and $|c\rangle$ respectively, and for which the $|a\rangle \rightleftharpoons |c\rangle$ and $|a\rangle \rightleftharpoons |b\rangle$ transitions are in the far from resonance interaction limit. The time evolution operator $U(t)$ for the atom-field interaction in a cavity C_k is given by [8]

$$\begin{aligned} U(\tau) = & -e^{i\varphi a_k^\dagger a_k} |a\rangle\langle a| + \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi a_k^\dagger a_k} + 1)|b\rangle\langle b| + \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi a_k^\dagger a_k} - 1)|b\rangle\langle c| + \\ & \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi a_k^\dagger a_k} - 1)|c\rangle\langle b| + \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\varphi a_k^\dagger a_k} + 1)|c\rangle\langle c|, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where a_k ($a_k^\dagger$) is the annihilation (creation) operator for the field in cavity C_k , $\varphi = 2g^2\tau/\Delta$, g is the coupling constant, $\Delta = \omega_a - \omega_b - \omega = \omega_a - \omega_c - \omega$ is the detuning where ω_a , ω_b and ω_c are the

frequency of the upper and of the two degenerate lower levels respectively and ω is the cavity field frequency and τ is the atom-field interaction time. For $\varphi = \pi$, we get

$$U(\tau) = -\exp\left(i\pi a_k^\dagger a_k\right) |a\rangle\langle a| + \Pi_{k,+}|b\rangle\langle b| + \Pi_{k,-}|b\rangle\langle c| + \Pi_{k,-}|c\rangle\langle b| + \Pi_{k,+}|c\rangle\langle c|, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{k,+} &= \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\pi a_k^\dagger a_k} + 1), \\ \Pi_{k,-} &= \frac{1}{2}(e^{i\pi a_k^\dagger a_k} - 1), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{k,+}|\alpha\rangle_k &= \frac{1}{2}|+\rangle_k, \\ \Pi_{k,-}|\alpha\rangle_k &= \frac{1}{2}|-\rangle_k, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\Pi_{k,+}|+\rangle_k = |+\rangle_k, \quad (6)$$

$$\Pi_{k,+}|-\rangle_k = 0,$$

$$\Pi_{k,-}|-\rangle_k = -|-\rangle_k,$$

$$\Pi_{k,-}|+\rangle_k = 0, \quad (7)$$

which are easily obtained from Eqs. (4) and (1) using $e^{za_k^\dagger a_k}|\alpha\rangle_k = |e^z\alpha\rangle_k$ [9].

First consider cavities C_1 and C_2 behind each slit and prepared in coherent state $|\alpha\rangle_1$ and $|\alpha\rangle_2$ respectively. Before the atom A_1 passes through the slits and cavities we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-SL_1-SL_2} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\zeta_1\rangle + |\zeta_2\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|b_1\rangle = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\zeta_1\rangle + |\zeta_2\rangle)\frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle_1 + |-\rangle_1]\frac{1}{2}[|+\rangle_2 + |-\rangle_2]|b_1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

After the atom A_1 passes through the cavities C_1 and C_2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_1 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_1)|\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ &|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|\alpha\rangle_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Just before the atom strikes the screen at x , if $U(t_1, t_0)$ is the time evolution operator, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}U(t_1, t_0)[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_1 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_1)|\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ &|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|\alpha\rangle_1], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x|\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_1 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_1)|\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ &\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|\alpha\rangle_1], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x | \Psi(t_1) \rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \langle x | U(t_1, t_0) | \Psi(t_0) \rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} \\ \psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x | U(t_1, t_0) | \zeta_1 \rangle, \\ \psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1) &= \langle x | U(t_1, t_0) | \zeta_2 \rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

where we have dropped the subindexes C_1 and C_2 . The probability density for detecting an atom at the position x on the screen is

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 &= \left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \right]^2 \{ |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2 + \\ &\quad 2Re[\psi_{\zeta_1}^*(x, t_1)\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)[\langle b_1 | b_1 \rangle_2 \langle \alpha | + \rangle_{21} \langle + | \alpha \rangle_1 + \\ &\quad \langle c_1 | c_1 \rangle_2 \langle \alpha | - \rangle_{21} \langle - | \alpha \rangle_1] \} = \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \right]^2 \{ |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2 + \\ &\quad 2Re[\psi_{\zeta_1}^*(x, t_1)\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)(2 - e^{-4|\alpha_1|^2} - e^{-4|\alpha_2|^2})] \}.\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

If we assume $|\alpha_1|^2, |\alpha_2|^2 \gg 1$ we have

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = \left[\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \right]^2 \{ |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2 + 4Re[\psi_{\zeta_1}^*(x, t_1)\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)] \}.\tag{15}$$

The injection of a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ in cavity C , is mathematically represented by $D(\beta)|\alpha\rangle = |\alpha + \beta\rangle$ where $D(\beta)$ is the displacement operator $D(\beta) = e^{(\beta a^\dagger - \beta^* a)}$ [3, 6, 9]. Now, lets us assume that after a three-level lambda atom A_1 has passed through cavities C_1 and C_2 we inject $|- \alpha\rangle_1$ in cavity C_1 and send a two-level atom A_2 resonant with the cavity, where $|f_2\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$ are the lower and upper levels respectively, through C_1 . If A_2 is sent through C_1 in the lower state, under the Jaynes-Cummings dynamics [3, 6] we know that the state $|f_2\rangle|0\rangle_1$ does not evolve, however, the state $|f_2\rangle|-2\alpha\rangle_1$ evolves to $|e_2\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle + |f_2\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle$, where $|\chi_{f1}\rangle = \sum_{n_1} C_{n_1} \cos(gt\sqrt{n_1+1})|n_1\rangle$ and $|\chi_{e1}\rangle = -i \sum_{n_1} C_{n_1+1} \sin(gt\sqrt{n_1+1})|n_1\rangle$ and $C_{n_1} = e^{-|2\alpha_1|^2} (-2\alpha_1)^{n_1} / \sqrt{n_1!}$.

After we inject $|- \alpha\rangle_1$ in cavity C_1 we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2}|f_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} [|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 + |-2\alpha\rangle_1) - \\ &\quad |c_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 - |-2\alpha\rangle_1)) |\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ &\quad |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|0\rangle_1] |f_2\rangle,\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

and after atom A_2 has passed through C_1 we can write the state of the system $A_1 - A_2 - C_1 - C_2$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_2-C_1-C_2} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} [|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|0\rangle_1 + |e_2\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle + |f_2\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle) - \\ &\quad |c_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|0\rangle_1 - |e_2\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |f_2\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle)) |\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ &\quad + |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|f_2\rangle|0\rangle_1].\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Now, before atom A_1 strikes the screen, we detect atom A_2 in the state $|e_2\rangle$. Then we get

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_2-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_2]. \quad (18)$$

Considering the evolution of atom A_1 to the screen

$$|\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}U(t_1, t_0)[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_2], \quad (19)$$

and

$$\langle x|\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\langle x|\psi_{\zeta_1}\rangle(|b_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_2], \quad (20)$$

and, dropping the subindexes C_1 and C_2 ,

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x)|^2. \quad (21)$$

Therefore, we conclude that atom A_1 has passed through slit SL_1 and cavity C_1 when we detect $|e_2\rangle$.

Now, lets us assume that just after atom A_1 has passed through cavities C_1 and C_2 we inject $|\alpha\rangle_1$ in cavity C_1 and $|\alpha\rangle_2$ in cavity C_2 send a two-level atom A_2 resonant with C_1 , where $|f_2\rangle$ and $|e_2\rangle$ are the lower and upper levels respectively, through C_1 , and a two-level atom A_3 resonant with C_2 , where $|f_3\rangle$ and $|e_3\rangle$ are the lower and upper levels respectively, through C_2 . If A_2 is sent through C_1 and A_3 is sent through C_2 in the lower states, under the Jaynes-Cummings dynamics [3, 6] we know that the state $|f_j\rangle|0\rangle_k$ does not evolve, however, the state $|f_j\rangle|-2\alpha\rangle_k$ evolves to $|e_j\rangle|\chi_{ek}\rangle + |f_j\rangle|\chi_{fk}\rangle$, where $|\chi_{fk}\rangle = \sum_{n_k} C_{n_k} \cos(gt\sqrt{n_k})|n_k\rangle$ and $|\chi_{ek}\rangle = -i \sum_{n_k} C_{n_k+1} \sin(gt\sqrt{n_k+1})|n_k\rangle$ and $C_{n_k} = e^{-|\alpha_k|^2} (-2\alpha_k)^{n_k} / \sqrt{n_k!}$ and where $j = 2, 3$ and $k = 1, 2$.

After we inject $|\alpha\rangle_1$ in cavity C_1 and $|\alpha\rangle_2$ in cavity C_2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_2-C_1-C_2}|f\rangle_2|f\rangle_3 &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 + |-2\alpha\rangle_1) - \\ &|c_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 - |-2\alpha\rangle_1))|0\rangle_2 + \\ &|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|0\rangle_2 + |-2\alpha\rangle_2) - \\ &|c_1\rangle(|0\rangle_2 - |-2\alpha\rangle_2))|0\rangle_1]|f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and after atom A_2 interacts with C_1 and atom A_3 interacts with C_2 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_2-A_3-C_1-C_2} &= \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_1 + \\ &|e_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle + |f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle) - \\ &|c_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_1 - \\ &|e_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle))|0\rangle_2 + \\ &|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_2 + \\ &|f_2\rangle|e_3\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle + |f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{f2}\rangle) - \\ &|c_1\rangle(|f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_2 - \\ &|f_2\rangle|e_3\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle - |f_2\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{f2}\rangle))|0\rangle_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Now, if we detect $|e_2\rangle$ we get

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_3-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|0\rangle_2], \quad (24)$$

and the only possibility is to detect A_3 in state $|f_3\rangle$ and we get

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|0\rangle_2]. \quad (25)$$

Making use of

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2}, \\ \psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

we have

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 \quad (27)$$

where we have dropped the subindexes C_1 and C_2 .

If we now detect $|e_3\rangle$ we get

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|f_2\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle + |c_1\rangle|f_2\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle)|0\rangle_1], \quad (28)$$

and the only possibility is to detect A_2 in state $|f_2\rangle$ and we get,

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle + |c_1\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle)|0\rangle_1]. \quad (29)$$

Making use of

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2}, \\ \psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

we have

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2 \quad (31)$$

where we have dropped the subindexes C_1 and C_2 . Notice that when we detect $|e_2\rangle$ or $|e_3\rangle$ the atomic state (of A_2 or A_3) gets disentangled of the cavity field state and one of the cavities evolves to the vacuum state ($|0\rangle_1$ or $|0\rangle_2$). Note also that as we are injecting $|\alpha\rangle_1$ in cavity C_1 and $|\alpha\rangle_2$ in cavity C_2 if atom A_1 had not left its signature ($(|\zeta_1\rangle + |\zeta_2\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2|b_1\rangle \rightarrow [|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_1 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_1)|\alpha\rangle_2 + |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|\alpha\rangle_1]$) in cavities C_1 and C_2 we would never detect states $|e_2\rangle$ and $|e_3\rangle$ since atoms A_2 and A_3 , that had been prepared in states $|f_2\rangle$ and $|f_3\rangle$, would interact with the vacuum fields $|0\rangle_1$ and $|0\rangle_2$. It is not possible to detect $|e_2\rangle$ and $|e_3\rangle$ simultaneously which would tell us that the atom A_1 , detecting its trajectory on the classical level and behaving like a classical particle, had passed through both slits. We can detect only $|e_2\rangle$ and $|f_3\rangle$ which says that the atom A_1 has passed through slit SL_1 or $|e_3\rangle$ and $|f_2\rangle$ which says that the atom A_1 has passed through slit SL_2 (a particle-like behavior).

Of course until we decide to get knowledge of the localization of the atom, everything behaves deterministically and the hole system evolves deterministically according to the Schrödinger equation and entanglement, which manifest only on the quantum mechanical level, takes place. When we

decide to magnify things, that is, to come from the quantum level to the classical level, we perform measurements using classical apparatus and the collapse of the wave function happens and indeterminism takes place. According to this, of course, after atom A_2 (or A_3) has passed through cavity C_1 (or C_2) we are not sure if we are going to detect $|e_2\rangle$ or $|f_2\rangle$ in the case of atom A_2 . If instead of detecting $|e_2\rangle$ we detect $|f_2\rangle$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_3-C_1-C_2} = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_1 + |f_3\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle) - \\ & |c_1\rangle(|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_1 - |f_3\rangle|\chi_{f1}\rangle)|0\rangle_2 + \\ & |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_2 + |e_3\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle + |f_3\rangle|\chi_{f2}\rangle) - \\ & |c_1\rangle(|f_3\rangle|0\rangle_2 - |e_3\rangle|\chi_{e2}\rangle - |f_3\rangle|\chi_{f2}\rangle)|0\rangle_1] \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Now, it is possible to detect atom A_3 in states $|f_3\rangle$ or $|e_3\rangle$. If we detect $|f_3\rangle$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 + |\chi_{f1}\rangle) - \\ & |c_1\rangle(|0\rangle_1 - |\chi_{f1}\rangle)|0\rangle_2 + \\ & |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle(|0\rangle_2 + |\chi_{f2}\rangle) - \\ & |c_1\rangle(|0\rangle_2 - |\chi_{f2}\rangle)|0\rangle_1] \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

and we cannot decide if atom A_1 has passed through slit SL_1 or slit SL_2 .

If instead of detecting $|f_2\rangle$ we detect $|e_2\rangle$ we get as we have shown above

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-A_3-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle - |c_1\rangle|f_3\rangle|\chi_{e1}\rangle)|0\rangle_2] \quad (34)$$

and the only possibility is to detect A_3 in state $|f_3\rangle$ and we can conclude that atom A_1 has passed through slit SL_1 and cavity C_1 .

Notice that if we do not send atoms A_2 and A_3 through C_1 and C_2 respectively, in order to get knowledge about which path the atom A_1 has traveled we are left with the wave function

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = & \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}[|\zeta_1\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_1 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_1)|\alpha\rangle_2 + \\ & |\zeta_2\rangle(|b_1\rangle|+\rangle_2 - |c_1\rangle|-\rangle_2)|\alpha\rangle_1]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Then, inspecting this wave function we see that we have two contributions: (1) atom A_1 has passed through cavity C_1 and has left cavity C_2 undisturbed or (2) atom A_1 has passed through cavity C_2 and has left cavity C_1 undisturbed. Therefore, we have a quantum superposition of this two alternatives and unless we perform a classical measurement to decide which path the atom A_1 has followed we cannot state that it has passed through C_1 or C_2 . The cavities just stores the information that atom A_1 has passed through both the slits. The cavities permits us to have the potential to get which-path information in this experiment but they do not tell us which path was followed because we are still in the quantum level and to get which-path information we have to come to the classical level performing measurements as we have described above sending, for instance, two two-level atoms A_2 and A_3 and detecting their excited states by a classical apparatus. Therefore, we cannot say that the atom A_1 has passed through just one of the slits. It has passed through both slits since it is a quantum object represented by a superposition of wave functions. Note that the interference fringes do not disappear

even though we have the potential possibility of getting which-path information in the future which is stored in cavities C_1 and C_2 . Without the cavities we get interference fringes because we do not have acquired even the potential possibility of deciding which path has been followed performing a classical measurement before the atom A_1 strikes the screen. When the atom A_1 strikes the screen, we can think it shines some light and we see in which point it has stricken the screen. Then at this point we come from the quantum level to the classical level and we have the collapse of the wave function. Without the cavities we say that we get the interference pattern because the atoms behaves as waves that interfere and we get the interference pattern, that is, we get regions on the screen that cannot be reached by atom A_1 . With the cavities the atoms are still described by a wave function and behaves as a wave passing through both slits and cavities, but we must stress again that, in this case, we do not get interference fringes only if we perform a measurement using a classical apparatus before atom A_1 strikes the screen to get which-path information.

Now let us assume that cavities C_1 and C_2 are prepared in an even coherent state $|+\rangle_1$ and an odd coherent state $|-\rangle_2$ respectively. Let us assume that we send three-level lambda atoms through the slits and cavities. Consider an atom A_1 prepared in the state $|b_1\rangle$ flying through the double slit. Before A_1 crosses the cavities we have

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-SL_1-SL_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\zeta_1\rangle + |\zeta_2\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2|b_1\rangle, \quad (36)$$

and after it has interacted with C_1 and C_2 , taking into account (3),

$$|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\zeta_1\rangle|b_1\rangle - |\zeta_2\rangle|c_1\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2. \quad (37)$$

Now, writing

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\Psi(t_0)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2}, \\ \psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle, \\ \psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1) &= \langle x|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where we have dropped the subindexes C_1 and C_2 and where x is a point on a screen in front of the double slit screen at a certain distance L from it, we have

$$\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|b_1\rangle - \psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|c_1\rangle\}. \quad (39)$$

and

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = \frac{1}{2}[|\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2], \quad (40)$$

since $\langle c_1|b_1\rangle = 0$ and if there were no cavities we would obtain

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = \frac{1}{2}[|\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2 + 2\text{Re}\{\psi_{\zeta_1}^*(x, t_1)\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)\}], \quad (41)$$

which presents interference fringes. Therefore, when we place cavities C_1 and C_2 prepared in the states $|+\rangle_1$ and $|-\rangle_2$ respectively, the interference fringes are washed out. This happens because the parity information of the cavities is transferred to the internal state of the atom. Notice that if we detect the atomic state of A_1 after it has crossed the slits and before it strikes the detection screen at x and we find $|b_1\rangle$, we can say that the atom has passed through slit SL_1 , and if we detect $|c_1\rangle$, we

can say that the atom has passed through slit SL_2 and we get which-path information (particle-like behavior) detecting the atomic state. That is, assuming that the detection of the internal states does not disturb the external state of motion of the atom, in the case we detect $|b_1\rangle$ we get

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = |\psi_{\zeta_1}(x, t_1)|^2, \quad (42)$$

and in the case we detect $|c_1\rangle$ we get

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_1)|^2 = |\psi_{\zeta_2}(x, t_1)|^2. \quad (43)$$

Therefore, the cavities allow us to get which-path information.

Now let us consider a four-slit experiment. We are going to consider screen SC_1 with slits SL_1 (at ζ_1) and SL_2 (at ζ_2), a screen SC_2 with slits SL_3 (at η_1) and SL_4 (at η_2) distant $L_1 = v(t_1 - t_0)$ from SC_1 and where v is the atom velocity, and a screen SC_3 distant $L_2 = v(t_2 - t_1)$ from SC_2 and where the atoms are going to strike at a point x . Making use of $|\eta_1\rangle\langle\eta_1| + |\eta_2\rangle\langle\eta_2| = 1$, after the atom has passed through SL_1 (and C_1) and SL_2 (and C_2) and before the atom passes through slits SL_3 and SL_4 we have

$$|\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\eta_1\rangle\langle\eta_1| + |\eta_2\rangle\langle\eta_2|)(U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle | b_1\rangle - U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle | c_1\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2 \quad (44)$$

After the atom has passed through SL_3 and SL_4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2-SL_3-SL_4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\langle\eta_1|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle | b_1\rangle|\eta_1\rangle + \langle\eta_2|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle | b_1\rangle|\eta_2\rangle \\ &- \langle\eta_1|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle|c_1\rangle|\eta_1\rangle - \langle\eta_2|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle | c_1\rangle|\eta_2\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Now writing

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1) &= \langle\eta_1|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle, \\ \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1) &= \langle\eta_2|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_1\rangle, \\ \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1) &= \langle\eta_1|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle, \\ \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1) &= \langle\eta_2|U(t_1, t_0)|\zeta_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(t_1)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2-SL_3-SL_4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle | b_1\rangle + \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle | b_1\rangle \\ &- \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle|c_1\rangle - \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle | c_1\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

We now let the atom evolve toward screen SC_3 and be detected at x and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x|\Psi(t_2)\rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2-SL_3-SL_4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1)\langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle | b_1\rangle + \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1)\langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle | b_1\rangle \\ &- \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1)\langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle|c_1\rangle - \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1)\langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle | c_1\rangle)|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and we write

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2) &= \langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle, \\ \psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2) &= \langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle, \\ \psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2) &= \langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_1\rangle, \\ \psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2) &= \langle x|U(t_2, t_1)|\eta_2\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x | \Psi(t_2) \rangle_{A_1-C_1-C_2-SL_3-SL_4} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1) \psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2) | b_1 \rangle + \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1) \psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2) | b_1 \rangle \\ &- \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1) \psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2) | c_1 \rangle - \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1) \psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2) | c_1 \rangle) | + \rangle_1 | - \rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Dropping the subindexes C_1, C_2, SL_3 and SL_4 we finally have the probability of the atom be detected at x

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_2)|^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \{ |\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2)|^2 + \\ &|\psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2)|^2 + \\ &2 \text{Re}[(\psi_{\zeta_1}^*(\eta_1, t_1) \psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1) + \psi_{\zeta_2}^*(\eta_1, t_1) \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1)) \psi_{\eta_1}^*(x, t_2) \psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2)] \} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

From the above expression we see that if we have two sharp peaks centered on η_1 and η_2 , that is, if $\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1) = \psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1) = 0$ and $\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1) \neq 0$ and $\psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1) \neq 0$ we get

$$|\Psi_{A_1}(x, t_2)|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \{ |\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_1, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_1}(x, t_2)|^2 + |\psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_2, t_1)|^2 |\psi_{\eta_2}(x, t_2)|^2 \} \quad (52)$$

and we have no interference. However, if $\psi_{\zeta_1}(\eta_2, t_1) \neq 0$ and $\psi_{\zeta_2}(\eta_1, t_1) \neq 0$ the interference term in (51) will not vanish.

Concluding, we can have a setup in which the mere introduction of a two-slit screen on the way of atom A_1 to the detection screen makes the observable behavior of atoms quite different of classical particles even in the situation in which the atoms were going to present a particle-like behavior. Of course Quantum Mechanics is the fundamental theory and all particles must behave according to it. Considering that the momentum of a particle is given by $p = h/\lambda$ we see that for classical particles, as the mass m is large, the momentum $p = mv$ is also large. Due to smallness of the Planck constant h and the largeness of the momentum p , the wavelength λ will be extremely small and this is why we do not observe interference for classical particles. More importantly, we notice that in Ref. [3] it is stated: "...The mere fact that we could in principle have which-path information is enough to rub out the fringes..." This is true for the systems studied in [1, 3, 4]. In these references, the mere presence of microwave cavities behind the slits wash out the interference fringes even though we do not make any direct measurement to get which-path information. However, the previous statement is a strong one and is not always true as we have seen in the present article. We have seen above that if the cavities are prepared in a coherent state, we can get which-path information but the interference fringes do not vanish due to only the presence of the cavities behind the slits. The fringes disappear only when we perform a measurement, after the atoms had passed through the cavities, and we get which path information. Therefore, we stress that the potential to get which-path information does not always destroys the interference fringes as we see in the case studied in the present article in which the cavities are prepared in a coherent state.

References

- [1] M. O. Scully and H. Walther, Phys. Rev. A **39**, 5229 (1989); M. O. Scully, B-G Englert and H. Walther, Nature **351**, 111 (1991); M. O. Scully and H. Walther, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 1562 (1994); M. O. Scully and H. Walther, Found. Phys. **28**, 399 (1998).

- [2] J. Baggott, New Sci. **133**, 36 (1992).
- [3] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, Quantum Optics, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [4] E. S. Guerra, Opt. Commun. **234**, 295 (2004).
- [5] A. A. Radzig and B. M. Smirnov, *Reference Data on Atoms, Molecules, and Ions* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985); T. F. Gallagher, *Rydberg Atoms* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1984).
- [6] M. Orszag, Quantum Optics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000.
- [7] E. S. Guerra, B. M. Garraway and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 3482 (1997).
- [8] P. L. Knight, Phys. Scr. **T12**, 51 (1986); S. J. D. Phoenix and P. L. Knight, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **7**, 116 (1990).
- [9] W. H. Louisell, *Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation*, (Wiley, New York, 1973).